PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 0026-0063

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:	)	**Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents**
	)	
Krishna BHARAT *et al.*	)	Group Art Unit: 2166
	)	
Application No.: 10/748,663	)	Examiner: N. Ahluwalia
	)	
Filed: December 31, 2003	)	
	)	
For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR PERSONALIZING AGGREGATED NEWS CONTENT	)	

APPEAL BRIEF

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in response to the Final Office Action mailed April 3, 2008 and in support of the Notice of Appeal filed September 3, 2008.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this appeal is Google Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals, interferences or judicial

proceedings.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 are pending in this application. Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 have been finally rejected and are the subject of the present appeal. Claims 1-22 and 32-38 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 have been reproduced in the Appendix.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment to the claims, filed August 4, 2008, was filed subsequent to the Final Office Action mailed April 3, 2008. A subsequent Advisory Action, dated August 29, 2008, indicates that the Amendment has not been entered.

An Amendment After Filing Notice of Appeal was filed December 23, 2008. A subsequent Advisory Action, dated January 15, 2009, indicated that the Amendment has been entered.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In the paragraphs that follow, a concise explanation of the independent claims, the claims reciting means-plus-function or step-plus-function language that are involved in this appeal, and the dependent claims that are argued separately will be provided by referring, in parenthesis, to examples of where support can be found in the specification and drawings.

Claim 23 recites: A method performed by a processor, comprising: receiving, at

the processor, a plurality of search queries from a client device (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); creating, by the processor, a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); receiving, at the processor, an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19); retrieving, by the processor, items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and inserting, by the processor, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 24 recites: The method of claim 23, further comprising: retrieving updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 370, Fig. 3C; page 12, line 11 – page 13, line 4); and periodically inserting the selected items of news content of the updated items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 31 recites: A news aggregation server, comprising: a memory configured to store instructions and news content (e.g., 230, Fig. 2; page 7, lines 3-7); and a processing unit (e.g., 220, Fig. 2; page 7, lines 3-7) configured to execute the instructions in memory to: obtain a plurality of search queries from a user (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10), create a customized news document including a plurality of personalized

news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18), retrieve items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2), receive an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19), rank, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order (e.g., page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2), and insert the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 39 recites: A system, comprising: means for receiving a plurality of search queries from a user (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); means for creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); means for receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; page 11, lines 3-19); means for retrieving items of news content from a plurality of sources of news content using the plurality of search queries (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document (e.g., 120, Fig. 1; 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 40 recites: A method performed by a processor, comprising: dividing, by the processor, a news document into a plurality of news sections (e.g., page 8, lines 8-18); receiving, at the processor, a first search query and a second search query from a client device (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); receiving, at the processor, an indication from a user of the client device specifying a manner of ranking news items within a first news section of the plurality of news sections (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19); searching, by the processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order (e.g., page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); populating, by the processor, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17); and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 44 recites: The method of claim 40, further comprising: receiving an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19), wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19).

Claim 47 recites: The method of claim 40, wherein ranking, based on the user

specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order comprises: receiving selected keywords from the user (e.g., page 8, lines 8-18); and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19).

Claim 48 recites: The method of claim 40, further comprising: receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19).

Claim 49 recites: The method of claim 40, further comprising: receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news (e.g., page 8, lines 8-18).

Claim 54 recites: A computer-readable memory device containing instructions for execution by one or more processors, the computer-readable memory device including instructions for performing a method, the method comprising: aggregating news content from a plurality of news source servers (e.g., 305, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); dividing a web page into a plurality of news sections (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); receiving a personalized search query from a user (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19); searching the aggregated news content based on the personalized search query to obtain a first set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and populating only a first

news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

Claim 61 recites: The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising: receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists (e.g., page 11, lines 3-19).

Claim 64 recites: A method performed by a device, comprising: crawling, by the device and using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers (e.g., 305, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); fetching, by the device, news content from the crawled news content documents (e.g., 305, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); indexing, by the device, the fetched news content to produce indexed news content (e.g., 310, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 1-7); dividing, by the device, a news document into a plurality of news sections (e.g., 315, Fig. 3A; page 8, lines 8-18); receiving, by the device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface (e.g., 325, Fig. 3B; page 8, line 19 – page 9, line 10); searching, by the device, the indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items (e.g., 350, Fig. 3B; page 9, line 11 – page 10, line 2); and populating, by the device, only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items (e.g., 355, Fig. 3C; page 10, lines 3-17).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WITTKE et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0059705) in view of MIYASAKA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,990,633) and YU (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0009497).

VII. ARGUMENTS

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU should be reversed.

The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention always rests upon the Examiner. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must provide a factual basis to support the conclusion of obviousness. In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 USPQ 173 (CCPA 1967). Based upon the objective evidence of record, the Examiner is required to make the factual inquiries mandated by Graham v. John Deere Co., 86 S.Ct. 684, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007). The Examiner is also required to explain how and why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been realistically motivated to modify an applied reference and/or combine applied references to arrive at the claimed invention. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 5 USPQ2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

1. Claims 23 and 25-30

Independent claim 23 recites a method performed by a processor that includes receiving, at the processor, a plurality of search queries from a client device; creating, by

the processor, a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries; receiving, at the processor, an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections; retrieving, by the processor, items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries; and inserting, by the processor, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Appellants' claim 23.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest, among other features, inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 23 (final Office Action, pg. 4). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

At paragraph 260, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> The knowledge system of this invention A) effectively integrates information from diverse sources, B) verifies, adds to or enhances source metadata (product data sheet; article title), and C) searches, queries, retrieves, and aggregates information. It identifies "things" people want, need and/or desire, given all the

> information and misinformation that's abundant in the world. It not only locates "things" for people, but also enriches their lives. It gives them more life. It "touches" people beyond helping them find that book they're looking for. It helps people live more and grow as people. It helps the person who from when they were a child wanted to become an actress but due to life's circumstances was never able to pursue their passion: there are countless people in the world with untapped passions and interests waiting to be unleashed with proper nurturing and guidance. The new knowledge system teaches people. It knows who someone is as a person--their personality, background, interests, etc.--to more effectively and efficiently teach them.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses retrieving and aggregating information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into at least one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Aggregating information simply does not correspond to inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into at least one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 281, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> FIG. 14B describes the sequence of events. After the mentor suggests a change to the database, an administrator is notified (email or instant alert) of the request for an addition. Upon approval via another set of user screens, the administrator approves (could also deny) of the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. For those people whom are currently connected as in web/internet--the next time their browser updates they will have new database structure information. All automatic. It's similar to adding a new

> directory on your computer to store stuff (Word docs--pictures, etc.) but being able to search, query, aggregate, etc. The stuff is stored in there automatically. (Attachment A sets forth the XML source code for performing the Add/Drop of Database Nodes function. The source code could be in other software languages.)

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. This section of WITTKE et al. deals with updating a database and does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 325, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> As previously mentioned and observable in FIG. 8, the PPE generates a Personality/Preference Token 22 per each client of the system. The token--as the title implies--stores a client selectable subset of information particular to them. In other words depending on their personal desires, they can increase and decrease the set of information stored per their token. This token or electronic collection of personal information has a number of uses, one of which is shown in FIG. 36 where a user may make the token available to third-party web sites which upon reading the token can customize the web-site offering to that client. The ACAS system enables users to customize their collection of information.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client. The token may, for example, be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting a user-

specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

Paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 19. At paragraph 291, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> FIG. 19 describes further how information from diverse sources in different formats with varying metadata is translated, classified, and stored in databases 27. Once again we see the information received is enhanced with additional metadata and recast into other forms and formats 40, all of which are also entered into the databases 27. The data received from one publisher has a high probability of being different from that of another. The information received from a single source must be translated 39 into formats and equivalents to that dictated by the CML 12. If in fact all sources adhered to a common descriptive standard, such translation would be minimized if not eliminated. But the nature of a free marketplace and a free world makes universal compliance to a single common standard highly unrealistic. Therefore such translation is required for the foreseeable future.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information does not correspond to inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Furthermore, databases 27 of WITTKE et al. does not correspond to a customized news document.

Therefore, even if the information of WITTKE et al. can reasonably be construed as corresponding to the items of news content of claim 23, WITTKE et al. merely discloses translating, classifying, and storing items of news content and does not disclose or suggest inserting items of news content into a section of a news document. Even if WITTKE et al. could be construed as disclosing inserting items of news content into a section of a news document (a point that Applicants do not concede), WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23.

At column 13, lines 26-40, MIYASAKA et al. discloses:

> A second way divides the document content such that a presentation of a first part of the content fits in the designated area and the remaining content is omitted. Preferably, some indication of the omission such as "More" or "Remainder omitted" is included in the article presentation. A document name or some document-access information such as a URL link for the full content of the document may be provided.
>
> Optionally, the recipient may be allowed to specify a maximum or preferred length of an article presentation, which could cause part of the second part to be omitted. If part is omitted, the presentation could include some indication of omission as described above. The length may be specified in essentially any manner such as the number of characters, number of lines, number of paragraphs, number of columns or column-inches, or number of pages.

This section of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest specifying a number of

news items to include in a personalized news section. Even if the designated area of MIYASAKA could be construed as corresponding to the personalized news section and the article of MIYASAKA et al. could be construed as corresponding to the items of news content, this section of MIYASAKA et al. would only disclose specifying a maximum length of an item of news content so that it would fit into the personalized news section. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraph 0052, YU discloses:

> As mentioned before, an important idea suggested by the current invention is that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in or communities instead of just individual users. When interest counts are stored relative to user communities, not only can the individual user's browsing behavior be used to select the specific content that is delivered to the user in the future, but the collective behavior of the communities can be mined and analyzed to deliver target content to the individual user as well. Community personalization can be a powerful notion in the art of personalization. The community bike news embodiment shows one way to personalize content based on community preferences and/or behaviors. Similar types of personalization based on preferences shown by sets of communities can be easily devised.

This section of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences does not correspond to inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. In fact, this section of YU does not even mention a customized news document. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest inserting, by a

processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23, as recited in claim 23.

At paragraphs 0055-0057, YU discloses that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. Even if a "best guess" search result can be construed as corresponding to items of news content (a point that Appellants do not concede), this section of YU would merely disclose delivering items of news content that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document, let alone inserting, by a processor, selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by a client device, to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of a customized news document, as recited in claim 23, as recited in claim 23.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 25-30 depend from claim 23. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23.

2. Claim 24

Claim 24 depends from claim 23. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 24 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 23. Moreover, claim 24 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU.

For example, claim 24 recites retrieving updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries; and periodically inserting the selected items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news document. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 0371 and 0378 of WITTKE et al. as allegedly disclosing these features (final Office Action, pg. 5). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraph 0371, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> The user's aggregation listings--i.e. collections of information, are constantly being updated. For example, a user might not view information for a couple of days; they're off busy with some problem that popped up. Now they go back to their user pages--they have been updated per information that arrived in the interim. The frequency with which listings are updated is configurable. Certainly if an article was retrieved and delivered that satisfied the user's interest with a high probability (i.e. something they would most definitely be interested in seeing/hearing), this item should remain in the aggregated listing throughout the gap in non-user viewing. If a user does not reset their selections, they are offered information based on the fixed setup indefinitely--of course given proper payment satisfaction.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses that a user's aggregated listings are constantly updated, even while the user does not view the information for a period of time. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose retrieving updated items of news content using a plurality of search queries. This section of WITTKE et al. further does not disclose or suggest inserting a specified number of news items into a customized news

document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest retrieving updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries; and periodically inserting the selected items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 24.

At paragraph 0378, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> Marking means identifying an item for further processing. Users are able to select items for storage in previously setup folders--for example disk directories. The folders are also candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. In other words on a particular day, a user might want to gather very specific information and also articles on the same topic gathered over the last couple of weeks. The articles would be evaluated for possibly inclusion, using the same logic applied to incoming news/data. FIG. 52 pictorially demonstrates two of these concepts. The two shown of potentially many updating scenarios are: 1) overwrite the old A with the new B or 2) Save a portion of A combined with the new B.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses including folders of articles on a topic gathered over the last few weeks with current aggregated listings. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose retrieving updated items of news content using a plurality of search queries. This section of WITTKE et al. further does not disclose or suggest inserting a specified number of news items into a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest retrieving updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries; and periodically inserting the selected items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 24.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

3. Claim 31

Independent claim 31 recites a news aggregation server that includes a memory configured to store instructions and news content; and a processing unit configured to execute the instructions in memory to: obtain a plurality of search queries from a user, create a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries, retrieve items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries, receive an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, rank, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order, and insert the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Appellants' claim 31.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIGS. 19 and 31 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim

31 (final Office Action, pp. 7-8). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 260 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. Searching and aggregating information does not correspond to receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections. In fact, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest that a user can specify a manner of ranking. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As further discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Updating a database does not correspond to inserting retrieved items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Furthermore, WITTKE et al. has nothing to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an

indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As also discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As additionally discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. (which describes FIG. 19) merely discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format,

which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information in a database is not the same as inserting selected items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of personalized news sections of a customized news document. Furthermore, WITTKE et al. has nothing to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore, paragraph 291 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

Paragraph 305 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 31. At paragraph 305, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> FIG. 31 pictorially describes how an originating user as well as a mentor of the CES system in most circumstances interacts with it for remote data and information entry, using a personal computer, the internet, and secure communications. As mentioned previously all three of the above instruments are well know and documented. Thus data and information can be recorded as the source material is created.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses the entry of data, from a user or system mentor, to a remote database using a personal computer via the Internet. Entering data into a database does not correspond to inserting selected items of news content in a ranked order into one of a plurality of personalized news sections of a customized news document. Furthermore, WITTKE et al. has nothing to do with receiving an indication

from a user specifying a manner of ranking news items. Therefore, paragraph 305 and FIG. 31 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences is not equivalent to receiving an indication from a user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of a plurality of personalized news sections of a

customized news document. In fact, this section of YU does not even mention a customized news document. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that WITTKE et al. discloses the above feature of claim 31 and relies on paragraphs 0367 and paragraphs 0378-0380 of WITTKE et al. for support (final Office Action, pg. 2). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraph 0367, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> In order to deliver information according to user selections, data must be ranked relative to other pieces of information. An index or ranking is calculated per data which falls within the user's chosen spheres of interest. This ranking is a weighted scoring technique. The user sets the weights associated with the parameters used in the logic, as well as those parameters to be included. In other words the user may choose to rank and deliver information solely based on his/her node ranking, ignoring other possible discretionary settings such as level of detail, ease of read or source of information. The ranking equation here shown has three weighted elements; this is merely an example; as indicated, actual ranking logic will vary.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses ranking data by using a weighted scoring technique designated by a user. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses that a user specifies a weighted scoring technique, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest inserting selected items of news content of retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections; ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

At paragraphs 0378-0380, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> Marking means identifying an item for further processing. Users are able to select items for storage in previously setup folders--for example disk directories. The folders are also candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. In other words on a particular day, a user might want to gather very specific information and also articles on the same topic gathered over the last couple of weeks. The articles would be evaluated for possibly inclusion, using the same logic applied to incoming news/data. FIG. 52 pictorially demonstrates two of these concepts. The two shown of potentially many updating scenarios are: 1) overwrite the old A with the new B or 2) Save a portion of A combined with the new B.

> Part of what the ADS 9 system does, is reconciling information/data throughout multiple listings. FIG. 53 demonstrates how a user is able to reconcile and update information per multiple mediums. Melissa listens to 4 audio segments--items A through D while on the way to work. As she listening to the segments, she has--through the software--noted the action to be taken per selection. During her lunch break those chosen items are deleted while those new ones E and F, and C which she wants to read are available in the new selection. Her next-morning audio selections reflect choices made the previous day.
>
> Thus the system's reconciliation apparatus allows users to have one or more aggregated listings per topic and per several delivery mediums. As another example, Pete might have a group of topics related to his profession and another group related to his hobby. Pete would have two running lists of material being presented to him per the two groupings. Pete might also choose a third group of topics which he likes to listen to during his commute to and from work in the car, say on gardening. In this case, Pete has three independent groupings which have two delivery methods--the first two via web/text and the third via audio selections. Pete, could however decide to both listen to and read information about his profession. In other words, he might want to listen to a portion in the morning and read the rest during his lunch hour. This invention allows Pete to manage aggregated listings independently and/or across mediums. The system allows him to delete an article he listened to in the car so that it does not appear in the text listing during his lunch hour.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses selecting items for storage in folders that are candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses aggregating content, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections, let alone ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order; and inserting the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 31.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

4. Claim 39

Independent claim 39 recites a system that includes means for receiving a plurality of search queries from a user; means for creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries; means for receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections; means for retrieving items of news content from a plurality of sources of news content using the plurality of search queries; and means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features in Appellants' claim 39.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest, among other features, means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 39 (final Office Action, pg. 7-8). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, at paragraph 260, WITTKE et al. discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on

knowledge of their personality, background or interests. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses retrieving and aggregating information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest means for inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into at least one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Aggregating information does not correspond to inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into at least one of a plurality of news sections of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, at paragraph 281, WITTKE et al. a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. This section of WITTKE et al. deals with updating a database and does not disclose or suggest means for inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, at paragraph 325, WITTKE et al. discloses the generation of a

preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client. The token may, for example, be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest means for inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 19. At paragraph 291, WITTKE et al. discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information does not correspond to inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Furthermore, databases 27 of WITTKE et al. does not correspond to a customized news document. Therefore, even if the information of WITTKE et al. can reasonably be construed as corresponding to the items of news content of claim 23, WITTKE et al. merely discloses translating, classifying, and storing items of news content and does not disclose or

suggest means for inserting items of news content into a section of a news document. Even if WITTKE et al. could be construed as disclosing inserting items of news content into a section of a news document (a point that Applicants do not concede), WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest means for inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, at column 13, lines 26-40, MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest specifying a number of news items to include in a personalized news section. Even if the designated area of MIYASAKA could be construed as corresponding to the personalized news section and the article of MIYASAKA et al. could be construed as corresponding to the items of news content, this section of MIYASAKA et al. would only disclose specifying a maximum length of an item of news content so that it would fit into the personalized news section. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document,

as recited in claim 39.

As noted above, at paragraph 0052, YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences does not correspond to inserting a user-specified number of selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document. In fact, this section of YU does not even mention a customized news document. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document, as recited in claim 39.

At paragraphs 0055-0057, YU discloses that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. Even if a "best guess" search result can be construed as corresponding to items of news content (a point that Appellants do not concede), this section of YU would merely disclose delivering items of news content that are relevant to specific communities of users. While this section of YU mentions the word "personalized," this section of YU does not disclose or suggest means for inserting selected items of news content into a news section of a customized news document, let alone means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to a number of items specified by the user to include in the at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document,

as recited in claim 39.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

5. Claims 40-43, 45, and 50-53

Independent claim 40 recites a method performed by a processor that includes dividing, by the processor, a news document into a plurality of news sections; receiving, at the processor, a first search query and a second search query from a client device; receiving, at the processor, an indication from a user of the client device specifying a manner of ranking news items within a first news section of the plurality of news sections; searching, by the processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain

a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items. The Examiner appears to rely on Figs. 2, 5, and 19, paragraphs 201-202, paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 40 (final Office Action, pg. 10). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Fig. 2 of WITTKE et al. depicts various scenarios in which not only is the information needed or desired different, but the manner in which it is preferred to be delivered varies from one person to another (paragraph 197). Fig. 2 of WITTKE et al. has nothing to do with populating a first news section with a first set of related news items and populating a second news section with a second set of related news items. Therefore, Fig. 2 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

Fig. 5 of WITTKE et al. discloses some concepts, such as a source and

psychological information, associated with news and information in general. Fig. 5 of WITTKE et al. has nothing to do with populating a first news section with a first set of related news items and populating a second news section with a second set of related news items. Therefore, Fig. 5 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

At paragraphs 201-202, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> Thus we see simplified examples of how an individual has a multitude of spheres of interest, each of which may contain a number of topics as well as sub-spheres. Spheres are merely groupings or associations of topics into a broader classification.
>
> Some spheres are larger than others, they vary in size and can be embedded with other spheres. The spheres of interest (the aggregate group) associated with every person will be not only unique, but multi-dimensional and vary over time. A twenty-year old interested in surfing may not be interested in surfing at age fifty. A sphere of interest related to a person's profession will obviously change as the person's career takes the inevitable shifts over time.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses that an individual has a multitude of spheres of interest that vary over time. This section of WITTKE et al. has nothing to do with populating a first news section with a first set of related news items and populating a second news section with a second set of related news items. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content

based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As discussed above, paragraph 260 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. Searching and aggregating information does not correspond to populating first and second news sections with different sets of related news items. In fact, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest a news section at all. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As further discussed above, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a

process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Updating a database does not correspond to populating first and second news sections with different sets of related news items. Therefore, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As also discussed above, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items

in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As discussed above, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences does not correspond to populating first and second news sections with different sets of related news items. In fact, this section of YU does not even mention a news section. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking

news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, searching, by a processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items; ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order; searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to obtain a second set of related news items; populating the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items, as recited in claim 40.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 41-43, 45, and 50-53 depend from claim 40. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection of claims 41-43, 45, and 50-53 be reversed for at least the

reasons set forth above with respect to claim 40.

6. Claim 44

Claim 44 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 44 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 44 recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU.

For example, claim 44 recites receiving an indication from a client device specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items. The Examiner relies on paragraph 342 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 44 (final Office Action, pg. 12). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

Paragraph 342 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the receipt of data by a user via an email attachment or similar delivery service. This section of WITTKE et al. does not have anything to do with receiving an indication from a client device specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section, wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 44.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least this additional reason, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

7. Claim 47

Claim 47 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 47 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 47 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU.

Claim 47 further recites receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 373-378 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing the features of claim 47 (Office Action, pg. 12). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraphs 0373-0378, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> Possible choices in handling information after it's delivered are:
> Delete Everything--"give me totally new material every week"
> Keep an article in current listing--"I want to read this latter."
> Delete this particular article--"Done with it."
> Mark this item for storage and forwarding--"Put this in my "Send-to-Joe" folder"
> Marking means identifying an item for further processing. Users are able to select items for storage in previously setup folders--for example disk directories. The folders are also candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. In other words on a particular day, a user might want to gather very specific information and also articles on the same topic gathered over the last couple of weeks. The articles would be evaluated for possibly inclusion, using the same logic applied to incoming news/data. FIG. 52 pictorially demonstrates two of these concepts. The two shown of potentially many updating scenarios are: 1) overwrite the old A with the new B or 2) Save a portion of A combined with the new B.

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses various options a user may select to handle information, including deleting the information, keeping the information for later reading, marking the information for forwarding to other users, or marking the information for further processing. This section of WITTKE et al., however, does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting

selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords, as recited in claim 47.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that WITTKE et al. discloses the above feature of claim 47 and relies on paragraphs 0378-0380 of WITTKE et al. for support (final Office Action, pp. 2-3). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

As discussed above with respect to claim 31, paragraphs 0378-0380 of WITTKE et al. disclose selecting items for storage in folders that are candidates for inclusion in aggregation listings. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving selected keywords from the user; and boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords, as recited in claim 47.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

8. Claim 48

Claim 48 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 48 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 48 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU.

Claim 48 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for

journalists who author news items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE for allegedly disclosing these features (final Office Action, pg. 13). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

Paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE et al. merely disclose that a user can specify what news or information they desire to receive, how they want the news or information presented to them and how they want the information updated and stored. This section of WITTKE, however, does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content. Therefore, WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content, where searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists, as recited in claim 48.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

9. Claim 49

Claim 49 depends from claim 40. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 49 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40. Moreover, claim 49 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU.

Claim 49 recites receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news. The Examiner relies on FIG. 14A and paragraph 280 of WITTKE et al. for allegedly disclosing these features (final Office Action, pg. 13). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

FIG. 14A and paragraph 280 of WITTKE et al. merely disclose the addition or removal of tree nodes from a database, such as, for example, adding a tree sub-node called "tennis" to the database under a node called "sports." This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose, suggest, or have anything to do with receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content. Therefore, WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news, as recited in claim 49.

MIYASAKA et al. and YU also do not disclose these features.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

10. Claims 54-60, 62, and 63

Independent claim 54 recites a computer-readable memory device containing instructions for execution by one or more processors, the computer-readable memory device including instructions for performing a method. The method includes aggregating

news content from a plurality of news source servers; dividing a web page into a plurality of news sections; receiving a personalized search query from a user; receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section; searching the aggregated news content based on the personalized search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest, among other features, populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items, as recited in claim 54. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing these features of claim 39 (final Office Action, pg. 15). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As noted above, at paragraph 260, WITTKE et al. discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. While this section of WITTKE et al. discloses retrieving and aggregating information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items. Aggregating information does not correspond to populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of

the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items, as recited in claim 54.

As noted above, at paragraph 281, WITTKE et al. discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. This section of WITTKE et al. deals with updating a database and does not disclose or suggest populating a first news section with a number of related news items. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. cannot disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items.

As noted above, at paragraph 325, WITTKE et al. discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client. The token may, for example, be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Although this section of WITTKE et al. discloses customizing a collection of information, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items, as recited in claim 54.

As noted above, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. describes FIG. 19. At paragraph 291, WITTKE et al. discloses the translation, classification and storage of

information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information does not correspond to populating a first news section of a web page. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of a web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items.

As noted above, at column 13, lines 26-40, MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest a user specified number of news items. Therefore, this section of MIYASAKA et al. cannot disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of a web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items, as recited in claim 54.

As noted above, at paragraph 0052, YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences does not correspond to inserting a user-specified number of news items into a web page. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of a web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items, as recited

in claim 54.

At paragraphs 0055-0057, YU discloses that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. While this section of YU mentions the word "personalized," this section of YU does not disclose or suggest populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of a web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items, as recited in claim 54.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYAKAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on CULLISS is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 55-60, 62, and 63 depend from claim 54. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54.

11. Claim 61

Claim 61 depends from claim 54. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 61 be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54. Moreover, claim 61 recites additional features not disclosed or suggested by WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU.

Claim 61 recites receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for

journalists who author new items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 347-350 of WITTKE et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 61 (final Office Action, pg. 18). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of WITTKE et al.

At paragraph 347-350, WITTKE et al. discloses:

> User's specify:
>
> What news/information they would like to receive
>
> How they want it presented to them--ex. text, audio, combination, spheres of interest
>
> How they want the information changed, updated, deleted and/or stored

This section of WITTKE et al. discloses that a user specifies what information to receive, how the information should be presented, and how the information should be updated, deleted, and/or stored. This section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest that the user can specify a journalist. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication from the user specifying for journalists who author new items of the news content, wherein searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists, as recited in claim 61.

For at least this additional reason, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

12. Claims 64-68

Independent claim 64 recites a method that is performed by a device. The method

includes crawling, by the device and using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers; fetching, by the device, news content from the crawled news content documents; indexing, by the device, the fetched news content to produce indexed news content; dividing, by the device, a news document into a plurality of news sections; receiving, by the device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, the indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items. WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 64.

For example, WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU do not disclose or suggest receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items. The Examiner appears to rely on paragraphs 260, 281 and 325 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al., column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al., and paragraphs 52 and 55-57 of YU for allegedly disclosing the features of claim 64 (final Office Action, pp. 18-19). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 260 merely discloses a knowledge system that searches and aggregates information and provides information to users based on knowledge of their personality, background or interests. Searching for

and aggregating information is not the same as populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, this section of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As further discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses a process by which a mentor suggests a change to a database and an administrator approves the change and sets flags for the back-end software to automatically adjust the database. Updating a database is not equivalent to populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, paragraph 281 of WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As also discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 325 of WITTKE et al. merely discloses the generation of a preference token 22 for each system client that stores a subset of information particular to the client, where the token may be used by third-party websites to customize the web-site offering to that client. Paragraph 325 of

WITTKE et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As additionally discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 291 of WITTKE et al. (which describes FIG. 19) merely discloses the translation, classification and storage of information from diverse sources having different data formats. In this section, WITTKE et al. discloses that information, such as, for example, data received from different publishers, is enhanced with metadata and then recast into a data format, which consists of a common descriptive standard, which then may be stored in a database. Translating, classifying, and storing information is not equivalent to populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, paragraph 291 and FIG. 19 of WITTKE et al. do not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, column 13, lines 26-40 of MIYASAKA et al. discloses specifying a maximum length of an article presentation so

the content fits in a designated area and the remaining content is omitted. This section of MIYASAKA et al. does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraph 52 of YU discloses that interest or activity counts should be stored relative to aggregations of users in communities instead of just individual users. Personalizing content based on community preferences is in no way equivalent to populating a first news section of a plurality of news sections of a news document with a set of related news items. Therefore, this section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

As discussed above with respect to claim 23, paragraphs 55-57 of YU disclose that a search engine can be enhanced to deliver community based "best guess" search results based on the generic search results that that are relevant to specific communities of users. This section of YU does not disclose or suggest, or have anything to do with, receiving, by a device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication

interface; searching, by the device, indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and populating, by the device, only a first news section of a plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items, as recited in claim 64.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on WITTKE et al., MIYASAKA et al., and YU is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claims 65-68 depend from claim 64. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of these claims be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 64.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, Appellants respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 23-31, 39-45, and 47-68.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP

By: /Meagan S. Walling, Reg. No. 60112/
Meagan S. Walling
Reg. No. 60,112

Date: February 11, 2009
11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (571) 432-0800
Facsimile: (571) 432-0808

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 44989

IX. APPENDIX

1-22. (Canceled)

23. A method performed by a processor, comprising:

receiving, at the processor, a plurality of search queries from a client device;

creating, by the processor, a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries;

receiving, at the processor, an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections;

retrieving, by the processor, items of news content from memory using the plurality of search queries; and

inserting, by the processor, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

24. The method of claim 23, further comprising:

retrieving updated items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries; and

periodically inserting the selected items of news content of the updated items of news content, corresponding to the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

25. The method of claim 23, wherein the items of news content are retrieved from a plurality of news source servers and aggregated via a news aggregation service in the memory.

26. The method of claim 25, wherein the customized news document is hosted at a news aggregation server that further hosts the news aggregation service.

27. The method of claim 25, wherein the customized news document is hosted at a server that is remote from a news aggregation server that hosts the news aggregation service.

28. The method of claim 23, further comprising:

notifying the client device of the updated items of news content.

29. The method of claim 28, wherein notifying the client device of the updated items of news content comprises notifying a user of the client device via at least one of a page, an e-mail, a FAX, and a telephone call.

30. The method of claim 23, further comprising:

registering the customized news document with a registry; and

providing access for other users to the customized news document via the registry.

31. A news aggregation server, comprising:

a memory configured to store instructions and news content; and

a processing unit configured to execute the instructions in memory to:

obtain a plurality of search queries from a user,

create a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries,

retrieve items of news content from the memory using the plurality of search queries,

receive an indication from the user specifying a manner of ranking news items within one of the plurality of personalized news sections,

rank, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in a ranked order, and

insert the selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content in the ranked order into the one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

32-38. (Canceled)

39. A system, comprising:

means for receiving a plurality of search queries from a user;

means for creating a customized news document including a plurality of personalized news sections, with each news section being defined by one of the plurality of search queries;

means for receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in at least one of the plurality of personalized news sections;

means for retrieving items of news content from a plurality of sources of news content using the plurality of search queries; and

means for inserting selected items of news content of the retrieved items of news content, corresponding the specified number of news items, into the at least one of the plurality of the personalized news sections of the customized news document.

40. A method performed by a processor, comprising:

dividing, by the processor, a news document into a plurality of news sections;

receiving, at the processor, a first search query and a second search query from a client device;

receiving, at the processor, an indication from a user of the client device specifying a manner of ranking news items within a first news section of the plurality of news sections;

searching, by the processor, news content based on the first search query to obtain a first set of related news items;

ranking, by the processor, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order;

searching, by the processor, the news content based on the second search query to

obtain a second set of related news items;

populating, by the processor, the first news section of the plurality of news sections with the first set of related news items in the ranked order; and

populating, by the processor, a second news section of the plurality of news sections with the second set of related news items.

41. The method of claim 40, wherein the first and second search queries are received from the client device via a network.

42. The method of claim 40, wherein the first and second search queries are selected by a user of the client device from a list of search queries.

43. The method of claim 42, wherein the list of search queries comprises search queries previously used by the user to search the news content.

44. The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the client device specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section,

wherein populating the first news section comprises obtaining the number of news items from the first set of related news items.

45. The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the client device specifying one or more preferences

for certain kinds of news sources for the news content,

wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the one or more preferences.

46. (Canceled)

47. The method of claim 40, wherein ranking, based on the user specified manner of ranking news items, the first set of related news items in a ranked order comprises:

receiving selected keywords from the user; and

boosting selected news items of the first set of related news items higher in the ranked order when the selected news items contain one or more of the selected keywords.

48. The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content,

wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists.

49. The method of claim 40, further comprising:

receiving an indication from a user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content,

wherein searching the news content based on the first search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news.

50. The method of claim 40, further comprising:

deleting the first news section from the news document based on an instruction received from a user.

51. The method of claim 40, further comprising:

labeling, on the news document, the first news section with a first label related to the first search query.

52. The method of claim 51, further comprising:

labeling, on the news document, the second news section with a second label related to the second search query.

53. The method of claim 40, wherein the first and second search queries are received from a user and further comprising:

providing the news document to the user.

54. A computer-readable memory device containing instructions for execution by one or more processors, the computer-readable memory device including instructions for performing a method, the method comprising:

aggregating news content from a plurality of news source servers;

dividing a web page into a plurality of news sections;

receiving a personalized search query from a user;

receiving an indication from the user specifying a number of news items to include in the first news section;

searching the aggregated news content based on the personalized search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and

populating only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the web page with a number of the first set of related news items corresponding to the user specified number of news items.

55. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, wherein the personalized search query is received from the user via a network.

56. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, wherein the personalized search query is selected by the user from a list of search queries.

57. The computer-readable memory device of claim 56, wherein the list of search queries comprises search queries previously used by the user to search the news content.

58. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user specifying one or more preferences for certain kinds of news sources for the news content,

wherein searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the one or more preferences.

59. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user that specifies a manner for ranking news content within the first news section; and

ranking news items of the first set of related news items in a rank order based on the specified manner for ranking.

60. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving selected keywords from the user; and

ranking selected news items of the first set of related news items based on the selected keywords.

61. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for journalists who author news items of the news content,

wherein searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user-specified preferences for journalists.

62. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

receiving an indication from the user specifying preferences for genres of news among the news content,

wherein searching the news content based on the personalized search query is further based on the user specified preferences for genres of news.

63. The computer-readable memory device of claim 54, further comprising:

providing the web page to the user.

64. A method performed by a device, comprising:

crawling, by the device and using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers;

fetching, by the device, news content from the crawled news content documents;

indexing, by the device, the fetched news content to produce indexed news content;

dividing, by the device, a news document into a plurality of news sections;

receiving, by the device, a first user search query from a client device via a communication interface;

searching, by the device, the indexed news content based on the first user search query to obtain a first set of related news items; and

populating, by the device, only a first news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the first set of related news items.

65. The method of claim 64, wherein the news document comprises a web page.

66. The method of claim 64, further comprising:

obtaining a second set of related news items from the fetched news content; and

populating a second news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the second set of related news items, wherein the second news section is

different than the first news section.

67. The method of claim 64, further comprising:

receiving a second user search query;

searching the indexed news content based on the second user search query to obtain a second set of related news items; and

populating only a second news section of the plurality of news sections of the news document with the second set of related news items.

68. The method of claim 23, further comprising:

crawling, using a web robot, news content documents hosted by a plurality of news source servers;

fetching news content from the crawled news content documents; and

indexing the fetched news content to produce indexed news content stored in the memory,

wherein retrieving items of news content from memory comprises:

searching the indexed news content based on the plurality of search queries to retrieve the items of news content.

X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None